

**Scharf-Norton Center for Constitutional Litigation at the  
GOLDWATER INSTITUTE**

James Manley (031820)  
Veronica Thorson (030292)  
500 E. Coronado Rd.  
Phoenix, AZ 85004  
(602) 462-5000  
[litigation@goldwaterinstitute.org](mailto:litigation@goldwaterinstitute.org)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF PIMA**

RICHARD RODGERS; SHELBY  
MAGNUSON-HAWKINS; and DAVID  
PRESTON,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CHARLES H. HUCKELBERRY, in his official  
capacity as County Administrator of Pima  
County; SHARON BRONSON, RAY  
CARROLL, RICHARD ELIAS, ALLYSON  
MILLER, and RAMÓN VALADEZ, in their  
official capacities as members of the Pima  
County Board of Supervisors; PIMA COUNTY,  
a political subdivision of the State of Arizona,

Defendants.

**Case No.:** C20161761

(Assigned to the Honorable  
Catherine Woods)

**JUDGMENT**

///

///

On February 2, 2017, this Court issued an Under Advisement Ruling granting Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and denying Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. For the reasons stated in that order, Plaintiffs are entitled to relief as a matter of law with respect to Count Two of their Complaint. The Court therefore ORDERS:

Pursuant to Ariz. R. Civ. P. 57, the Court declares that Defendants violated A.R.S. § 11-256 when they entered into the Headquarters Lease-Purchase Agreement (PSOF, Ex. 1) ("Agreement") with World View Enterprises for a County-owned building and that the Agreement is therefore unlawful;

The Court has broad discretion to craft an injunction. *Scholten v. Blackhawk Partners*, 184 Ariz. 326, 331 (App.1995). ("An injunction is an equitable remedy, which allows the court to structure the remedy so as to promote equity between the parties. The discretion in injunctive proceedings lies with the trial court, not the reviewing court."). Pursuant to Ariz. R. Civ. P., Rule 65, Defendants must cancel the Lease-Purchase Agreement no later than 270 days after the entry of this Judgment, but may, during that time period, enter into an agreement following the process under A.R.S. § 11-256;

Pursuant to Ariz. R. Civ. P. 54(b), the court finds that there is no just reason to delay entry of judgment on Count Two and therefore directs entry of a final judgment on Count Two under Rule 54(b).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, for reasons stated on the record in the April 17, 2017 hearing on Defendants' Motion for Stay, the operation of Judgment on Count Two of Plaintiffs' Complaint is stayed until a final decision is rendered on appeal from that Judgment.

Dated this 19 day of April, 2017

  
**HON. CATHERINE WOODS**

(ID: d757c9f6-588a-4196-bf41-8fd78c69c990)